



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/790,240	03/02/2004	Ryoji Ninomiya	008312-0308562	9884
909	7590	10/03/2008	EXAMINER	
PILLSBURY WINTHROP SHAW PITTMAN, LLP			MAPLES, JOHN S	
P.O. BOX 10500			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
MCLEAN, VA 22102			1795	
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
10/03/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/790,240	Applicant(s) NINOMIYA ET AL.
	Examiner John S. Maples	Art Unit 1795

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 June 2008.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1 and 3-14 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) 5-14 is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1, 3, 4 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/DS/06)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____

Art Unit: 1795

1. Claim 12 is withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in the reply filed on 20 June 2008.

2. The documents set forth on the IDS filed August 10, 2004 were crossed out because all of these documents were considered in the IDS initialed, signed and dated by the examiner and sent to applicant on July 25, 2007.

3. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

4. Claims 1, 3, 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claims contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventors, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. (New Rejection)

Claim 1 recites in both line 3 and in lines 7-8, that an LED is powered by a fuel cell. The present specification does not support this limitation in the claim. Page 12, lines 3-5 of the present specification recites that the fuel cell unit 2 displays a state by use of LED's, however, the specification does not specifically state that the LED's are powered by the fuel cell. It is noted that the fuel cell unit includes not only the DMFC as a power source but also includes the secondary

Art Unit: 1795

cell 23. Therefore either of these sources could provide power and the specification does not recite which source is used.

It is also noted that the present specification clearly recites that the DMFC provides power to the electronic apparatus 1 as set forth, for example, on page 4, lines 19-23, among other places in the specification. However, the specification does not specifically teach that the LED's are powered by the DMFC

In lines 5-6 of claim 1, the connection detecting unit is recited as being powered by the fuel cell, however, there is no support for this language in the presently filed specification. As stated above, it is noted that the fuel cell unit includes not only the DMFC as a power source but also includes the secondary cell 23. Therefore either of these sources could provide power and the specification does not recite which source is used.

Claims 3 and 4, dependent on claim 1, fall therewith.

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

6. Claims 1 and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Harris et al.-US 2001/0052433. (Harris) (New Rejection)

Reference is made to paragraph 40 of Harris along with Figure 2 of the same. These portions teach an electronic apparatus 10, which apparatus displays (display control unit) with LED's, for example, information from a sensing

Art Unit: 1795

unit regarding the fuel cell status-see the last four lines in the left column on page 4 of Harris. One abnormal state could be when the fuel cell is not running when the fuel cell is properly set and should be running. The display control unit also is a connection detecting unit as claimed by applicant because the display unit will not display unless the same is connected to the electronic apparatus. The claimed notifying unit of claim 3 is met by the teachings in Harris of the display unit 10.

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

9. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Harris taken in view of Ozeki-US 2004/0170876. (Ozeki) (New Rejection)

Art Unit: 1795

The only claimed feature not taught by Harris is the sensing unit detecting the inclination of the fuel cell. Ozeju teaches in paragraphs 38, 51 and 78 a sensing unit that detects the tilt direction of a fuel cell and displays the information. To have included in Harris the sensing unit to detect inclination of the fuel cell therein as shown by Ozeki would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time the invention was made so that the fuel cell would not be damaged if misused or handled in a rough manner.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to John S. Maples whose telephone number is 571-272-1287. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 8:00-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Patrick Ryan can be reached on 571-272-1292. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1795

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/John S. Maples/

John S. Maples
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1795

JSM/9-30-2008

Application Number 	Application/Control No.	Applicant(s)/Patent under Reexamination
	10/790,240 Examiner John S. Maples	NINOMIYA ET AL. Art Unit 1795